July 6 2010

Ed Smith
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF MONTANA

DALE L. KEIL, Pro Se 315 South Main, Suite A Conrad, Montana 59425 Telephone: (406) 271-5575 FAX: (406) 271-7546 Email: keillaw@3rivers.net

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

FILED

JUL 0 6 2010

Ed Smith
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF MONTANA

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Supreme Court Cause No DA-10-0287

DALE L. KEIL,

Appellant.

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF JAMES R. BREWSTER, Deceased,

Appellee,

MOTION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION OF JUDGMENT AND APPROVAL OF SUPERSEDEAS BOND

On Appeal from the Montana Ninth Judicial District Court, Teton County, The Honorable Laurie McKinnon, Presiding Cause No. DP-07-08

COMES NOW Dale L. Keil and respectfully moves this Court, pursuant to Rule 22(2) Mont. R. App. P. to stay, pending and during appeal, the judgment entered as the court's Order for Reimbursement of Attorney Fees in Excess of Statutory Fees, dated June 1, 2010 (filed June 1, 2010) and for approval of the Supersedeas Bond. In support of the Motion, Appellant states that, if obtained, the Appellee will most likely disburse the funds to Billie Brewster, surviving spouse; that if Appellant is successful, Billie Brewster may not be able to repay

the amounts; and that the Estate of James R. Brewster has been distributed; therefore, no repayment would be possible.

SHORT STATEMENT OF MOTION

Notice of Appeal was filed with the Supreme Court on June 10, 2010 and with the District Court on June 11, 2010. On June 11, 2010 Dale L. Keil filed a Motion For Stay of Execution of Judgment and Approval of Supersedeas Bond with the Ninth Judicial District Court. (See Exhibit 4) The District Court entered its Order on June 23, 2010 denying Mr. Keil's Motion. (See Order Denying Request For Stay And Approval Of Supersedeas Bond attached as Exhibit 1).

The Affidavit of Dale L. Keil is attached as Exhibit 5.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Appellant filed a Motion for Stay of Execution of Judgment and a proposed supersedeas bond with the District Court on June 1,2010. The District Court denied the Motion and the bond. (See Exhibit 1)

Rule 22 Mont. R. App. P. requires a litigant seeking a stay of order pending and during appeal and approval of a supersedeas bond to request the stay and bond approval first from the District Court. Rule 22 (1)(a) i, ii Mont. R. App. P. (2009). The rule provides that the District Court "retains the power to entertain and rule upon a motion filed pursuant to this rule despite the filing of a notice of appeal..." Rule 22 (1)(c) MT R. App. P. (2009). The appellant must obtain the district court's approval of the supersedeas bond. Rule 22 (1) (c). Finally, the rule requires the District Court to "promptly enter a written order on a motion filed under this rule and include in findings of fact and conclusions of law, or in a supporting rationale, the relevant facts and legal authority on which the District Court's order is based," Rule 22 (1) (d).

The District Court allowed time for parties to object and Billie Brewster,

surviving spouse, did object. Appellant argues that there is no right to object at the District Court level. The Motion for Stay of Execution of Judgment was denied on June 23, 2010. (See Exhibit 1).

Rule 22 (2) MT R. App. P. (2009) provides that on the grant or denial of a motion for relief under section (1)(a) of this rule, a motion for relief from the district court order may be filed in the supreme court within 11 days of the date of entry of the district court order. The Motion must demonstrate good cause for the relief requested, supported by affidavit; must include copies of relevant documents from the record; and must include a copy of the district court's order issued pursuant to section (1)(d) of this rule.

This Court ruled in 183 Mont. 439, 600 P.2d 206 that "The purpose of a supersedeas bond as a condition for staying enforcement and execution on a judgment is to guarantee and secure the rights of the judgment creditor during the appeal process. At the same time it preserves and implements the judgment debtor's statutory right of appeal. It is well established that a supersedeas bond may be required to preserve the rights of the unsuccessful party. Gallatin Trust and Savings Bank v. Henke (1969), 154 Mont. 170, 461 P.2d 448, and cases therein cited."

The appellant does not want to risk that the Estate may execute on Appellant's property during the pendency of the appeal, and that the appeal might become moot as argued *In re the Marriage of Gorton, 2008 MT 123, 342 Mont.* 537, 182 P.3d 746. Appellant requests that the Motion for Stay of Execution of Judgment be granted preserving his statutory right of appeal.

DATED this 3 day of July, 2010.

Dale L. Keil, Pro Se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 2 I hereby certify that I have filed a true and accurate copy of the foregoing MOTION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION OF JUDGMENT AND APPROVAL OF 3 SUPERSEDEAS BOND with the Clerk of the Montana Supreme Court; and that I 4 have served true and accurate copies of the foregoing MOTION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION OF JUDGMENT AND APPROVAL OF SUPERSEDEAS BOND 5 upon each attorney of record, and each party not represented by an attorney in the 6 above-referenced District Court action by depositing the same in the United States Post Office at Conrad, Montana in envelopes addressed to the following-named 7 persons at the addresses below, securely sealed and postage prepaid: 8 9 (Individually and as Personal Representative Laura Hodgskiss P.O. Box 1367 of the Estate of James R. Brewster) 10 Choteau, MT 59422 11 Jeri Lee Brewster 12 P.O. Box 263 13 Choteau, MT 59422 Daniel E. Shannon, Shannon Legal Services, PC 14 401 3rd Avenue North Kyle J. Brewster 15 P.O. Box 1709 P.O. Box 737 Great Falls, MT 59403-1709 Choteau, MT 59422 16 17 18 19 Dated this 4th day of July, 2010 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1

icia a Keil